

# Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR  
BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

## How Can We Preserve Peace and Freedom Today?

*Moderator,* GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

### *Speakers*

WALTER H. JUDD  
PANAYOTIS KANELLOPOULOS

JOHN SCOTT  
BROOKS EMENY

(See also page 13)

### COMING

—April 20, 1948—

## What Next in Europe Now?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.



## CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

### THE BROADCAST OF APRIL 13:

#### "How Can We Preserve Peace and Freedom Today?"

Mr. DENNY .....	3
Congressman JUDD .....	4
Mr. SCOTT .....	6
Mr. KANELLOPOULOS .....	9
Mr. EMENY .....	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN .....	13
QUESTIONS, PLEASE! .....	14



### THE BROADCAST OF APRIL 20:

#### "What Next in Europe Now?"



The Broadcast of April 13, 1948, originated in Municipal Auditorium, New Orleans, Louisiana, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Company Network.



Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

# Illinois U Library

# *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



APRIL 13, 1948

VOL. 13, No. 51

## How Can We Preserve Peace and Freedom Today?

### Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Mayor Morrison, I want to thank you for the wonderful hospitality you and the people of New Orleans have shown all of us since we arrived here in your city. I'm sure that this fine audience here is as deeply concerned about tonight's question as all freedom-loving people everywhere. It has been Town Meeting's purpose to discuss not only specific problems of the day such as we did last week, but to consider these problems also in terms of basic principles of human relations such as we expect to do with our question tonight, "How Can We Preserve Peace and Freedom in the World Today?"

If we are to judge by a comprehensive survey of European nations published in the current issue of *Time*, the weekly news magazine, these people still put a very high value on the basic freedoms, and it is certain that they and we do not want to become involved in another war.

The basic question is, what principle should we follow now in order to preserve peace and freedom in the world as it is today?

We've seen two world organizations built on the principles of maintaining absolute national sovereignty fail to meet the real purposes for which they were founded. Sovereign nations are the last political groups to hold themselves beyond the scope of law.

Can we secure peace and freedom then without extending the principle of law to the world community? A part of the world as presently organized has made it abundantly clear that it will not accept this principle. Science has made us one world of neighbors, but politically we have two worlds, which today appear to be headed for ultimate armed conflict for survival. Is such a conflict inevitable?

While the battleground—the immediate battleground—is Western Europe, it is actually a worldwide struggle. So we are asking counsel tonight of Congressman Walter



Judd, Republican of Minnesota; Panayotis Kanellopoulos, former Prime Minister of Greece; Mr. John Scott, Chief of the Berlin Bureau of *Time*, the weekly news magazine; and Mr. Brooks Emeny, President of the Foreign Policy Association, who is pinch-hitting for Mr. Vincent Sheean who is ill.

Congressman Walter Judd, formerly a medical missionary to China, who can speak with equal authority on the problems of maintaining peace and freedom in China and America, is also a political philosopher and a statesman. Congressman Judd's is a familiar voice to Town Meeting listeners and we value highly his contributions to our programs over the years. I'm sure that you, our listeners, share this view. Welcome to New Orleans, Congressman Judd. (Applause.)

#### **Congressman Judd:**

The plainest fact we face today, Mr. Denny, as you have well said, is that we don't have one world as we had hoped and prayed we would have. We have two worlds. Men and nations are split wide open, not only politically and economically but ideologically and spiritually.

The second plainest fact is that we cannot go on indefinitely or even very long as two such worlds. Our planet is too small. We are too interdependent. The two worlds must become one.

There are only two ways that

can be done. One way is by conquest. The other way is by agreement.

Mr. Stalin believes in the former. Years ago he wrote, "Ultimately one or the other must conquer."

We don't believe in that way. We don't want conquest of us by them, but don't want conquest of them by us.

I see no hope of establishing peace and freedom on a reasonably secure basis except through a world organization so revised and strengthened that it can effectively handle all threats to the peace in the name and in the organized strength of free men everywhere.

Common people everywhere placed their faith in the United Nations as such an agency. It is clear from the experience of the last two years that in its present form it cannot do the job. In fact it is so constructed that one of the Big Five by its veto can use the United Nations machinery to prevent the making of peace, to defeat the very thing it was supposedly set up to promote—yes, to guarantee.

We agreed to the Big Power veto to make sure the organization could not make war unjustifiably on any member nation. We were too naive to realize and too trusting to suspect that the Soviet rulers were coolly planning to use the veto, not to make peace, but to make war.

They have not used the veto once to prevent war. They have

used it repeatedly to defeat measures or decisions that were in the direction of peace. At Teheran, Yalta, and elsewhere, our leaders, in order to get Russia to come along with the United Nations, yielded to her on matters of principle and on solemn pledges, including those in the Atlantic Charter, apparently assuming that if Russia joined it would be for the same reason we and the others joined, namely, to help solve world problems.

But it soon became clear that the Soviet Government came in not to get solutions to problems but to block solutions, not to make the U. N. work but to be in the best possible position to make sure that it does not work.

The Kremlin already has its world-wide organization — the Communist Party. It has a dozen countries under complete control, plus trained and disciplined units in every other country. Believe me, that world organization is already functioning — efficiently and at full speed. It intends to win and in order to do so it must keep any other world organization crippled and ineffective.

That is an intolerable situation for those who really want peace and freedom. The remedy is not to abandon the U. N. or to bypass it but to revise it so that it can function as intended. We must get its structure modified so that it can and will work, with Russia

if possible, but without her if necessary.

At least three-fourths of the people of the world would join us in such an effort, but they cannot move without our active initiative and leadership.

Last year, a group of Representatives and Senators of both political parties introduced a resolution urging the President to call immediately, under Article 109, a general conference of the United Nations for the purpose of improving its machinery.

On March 16 of this year, seven Republicans and seven Democrats, in the House of Representatives, introduced a more specific resolution to the same effect. Sixteen members of the Senate of both parties introduced essentially the same resolution into that body only yesterday. It calls for revision of the Charter to eliminate the veto in matters of aggression and armament for aggression, to provide for inspection and control of atomic and other important weapons; and to set up an international police force recruited from volunteers from the smaller member states and supported, if necessary, by the armed forces of the major states which would be limited to agreed quotas.

Should Russia refuse to cooperate in such changes which would guarantee her own security, then at least the world will know that her real objective is not security, but conquest and the other nations



can go ahead under Article 51 of the Charter which authorizes members to unite for collective self-defense.

This time, we must get an organization based on justice under world law and with a policeman. The gun must be in the policeman's hand against any aggressor rather than in any aggressor's hand against the organization and against humanity.

We must move as effectively to strengthen our moral and our legal positions as we are moving to strengthen our economic and military positions.

Whenever enough of the peaceful governments and peoples of the world get together on a basis that makes clear to the men in the Kremlin, first, that they do not need to go to war to get security or satisfaction of any legitimate grievances Russia may have, and second, that they cannot succeed even if they do go to war, at that point, I believe, there is a good chance they will come along, because agreement then becomes more advantageous than attempted conquest.

I recognize fully that, due to our drift and indecision, it may already be too late to prevent a blowup in the next few weeks or months. But our best chance to preserve peace and freedom today consists in adequate strengthening of our own defenses, carrying out swiftly and efficiently the economic and military assistance programs to

which we have already set our hands in Europe and Asia, and exercising positive, vigorous, imaginative leadership to develop and improve the United Nations until, please God, it can be made capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law governing the relations between the nations and peoples of the earth. (*Applause.*)

#### **Moderator Denny:**

Thank you, Congressman Judd. One of the most difficult trouble spots in the world today is Berlin, Germany. So let's hear from the chief of the Berlin Bureau of *Time*, the weekly news magazine—Mr. John Scott, who has held two important assignments in Russia over a period of eight years, prior to his assignment in Berlin, and has found time to write three books. From his present vantage point in Berlin, he's able to make an extremely important contribution to this discussion, for peace and freedom are rather empty words in Berlin today, are they not, John Scott? (*Applause.*)

#### **Mr. Scott:**

Last year, I visited the Ruhr with the Herter Committee. One of its members was Gene Coe, Democrat of Georgia. We spent one whole morning going over figures with officials and in the afternoon we visited the homes of Germans who mine coal and make steel in the world's greatest heavy industry base outside of the United States.

We had heard that many of these Germans were Communists. We found their homes frightful, dank, windowless cellars in rubble heaps—often a family or more to a room; children with rickets, and old people with tuberculosis.

After a dozen of these houses, Cox said, with tears of frustration in his eyes, "You know, if I had to live like this for very long, I think I'd be a Communist—I mean a Republican."

I agree very thoroughly with Walter Judd that measures must be taken to stop communist aggression if we are to have either peace or freedom. But I cannot help thinking that many threats to peace and freedom come not so much from communist agents as from our own inadequacies.

For example, Western Germany, administered for these three years by Britain and the United States, has a steel production potential of about 18 million tons a year. Under present international agreements, we may produce 10.8 million tons of steel a year in Western Germany. In 1947, we actually did produce less than 3 million tons.

If America is supposed to be able to do anything superlatively well, it is to get factories working. The Ruhr miners and steelworkers today get some 2,500 calories a day, and their families are getting less than 1,000 calories a day, in the western part of Germany. This is flagrantly inadequate. Both

miners and their families are better fed in the coal mining areas in the Soviet Zone.

True, in Western Germany, people are much freer, but freedom on 900 calories a day leaves much to be desired.

For many in the Ruhr, it is not at all clear that the democracy brought by liberating Western armies is preferable to the Eastern totalitarian planned economy. For millions of people in Europe, we have failed to demonstrate the superiority of democracy by making it work effectively. ERP is the attempt to rectify this situation, and in my opinion it is the most important single operation we have on hand today and deserves the unstinted support of all of us.

Some people seek an easy solution to our difficulties by a quick, decisive, preventative war against the Russians. I disagree. If we seek to destroy the Russians militarily, we, with our present four divisions and our potential seventy divisions, with our strong Navy and Air Force, but without allies with large land armies, would have to invade a nation with some 175 divisions now and with a potential of some 300 divisions and with some very boisterous and vigorous allies.

Military experts estimate that the Russians would occupy all of Europe and much of Asia during the opening weeks of such a war, leaving us, if we chose to do so, to drop atomic bombs on Moscow



and Magnitogorsk, but hardly in a position to deliver the *coup de grace* by invasion, which both Napoleon and Hitler failed to do under much more favorable circumstances.

Such a policy would have much more likelihood of leading us to civil war at home than to peace and freedom in the world. Science and particularly the atomic bomb have rendered meaningless the barnacled arguments that peace and freedom can be won by the physical destruction of our enemies.

We can no longer afford to try to destroy our enemies. While it would be too much to expect us all to love them we can strike a human middle way by sticking to peaceful competition.

Business competitors rarely use machine guns and tear gas against each other. They try to produce better products more cheaply, and they advertise the merits of their own products and sometimes publicize the shortcomings of those of their competitors. In concrete terms this means that we must make democracy produce in those areas, like Germany, that we control, and we must point this fact out convincingly to all concerned.

At the same time, we must lay bare the inequalities and shortcomings of totalitarianism so persistently that our world will be safe not only from military aggression but also from conspiratorial fifth column infiltration.

To do this, we do not need large infantry force, we do not need UMT or the mobilization of the American Armed Forces. Indeed, these things might lend credence to communist accusation that we are planning to conquer the world by main force of arms.

To make such political warfare or "peacefare" effective, we must keep the flag of freedom flying high and spotless in the sun of our democracy. This we have frequently failed to do.

What, for example, was the reaction of the people of Spain, who for years have been writhing under a dictatorship as totalitarian and ruthless as any, when we rendered economic support to its dictatorship and talked openly about building him up as a bulwark against communism.

What is the reaction of the Indonesian patriots or the Indian Chinese farmer, fighting the same fight that we fought 175 years ago when he is crushed by tanks made in Detroit and shipped to battle in American steamers guarded by the American Navy.

For these people, our talk of freedom seems less than convincing. Some, in desperation, embrace the ideology of a communist state they do not know.

We cannot win such people to our side by dropping atom bombs on Moscow. Rather, we must go to work on our own policy, we must make freedom sing from Hamburg to Harlem, from Ne-



Orleans to Shanghai. If we do these things, and I'm sure we can, we'll have peace and freedom. (*Applause.*)

**Moderator Denny:**

Thank you, Mr. Scott. Now, let's go to the southeast corner of Europe and hear a spokesman from that ancient citadel of freedom and culture, Greece. Panayotis Kanellopoulos was Prime Minister of Greece shortly after the Nazi domination of that country. He is now a member of the Greek Parliament, and is visiting this country as a guest of *Time* magazine, and to counsel with the American people on the best ways to preserve peace and freedom in the world today. We are happy and honored indeed to present him to our Town Meeting audience here tonight. Mr. Kanellopoulos. (*Applause.*)

**Mr. Kanellopoulos:**

I like very much the good will of my friend John Scott and I share it. I'm afraid, however, he forgets, that in order to maintain peace, even the archangels are ardent explorers and do not rely only on their beautiful wings.

Freedom and peace are two great virtues. God would wish very much to see them live together, just as you would wish to see man and wife live together always. But time and life—please do not confuse them with the well-known magazines—very often part those whom God has united.

You ask how does it happen that today freedom and peace are endangered? They are endangered only because there are countries where there is no freedom. Those countries are trying to force upon other countries their barbaric totalitarian system.

Democracy is tolerant while totalitarian communism is not. Democracy acknowledges the right of free friendship between people, while totalitarian communism forbids you to have other ideas outside of those controlled by the party.

You do not have even the right to be yourself. Democracy is based on freedom of speech and discussion while totalitarian communism is based on the spy system. If communism decided to invite us to Moscow, so that we could hold the next Town Meeting of the Air there, the world would be saved, and history would proclaim Mr. Denny its saviour. (*Laughter and applause.*) I don't see, however, that it is very probable that such a thing could happen.

There are, fortunately, other means which can save peace and freedom. One of these is the Marshall Plan. Communism seeks to bring countries—especially the European countries which are still democratic—to an economic impasse. The Marshall Plan may well save democratic Europe from economic destruction and lessen the possibility of war.

A second way to save peace and

freedom is the confederation of the democratic countries of Europe. One focal point of such a confederation is the pact of the five democracies of Western Europe. It is of great historical significance that the United States saluted at once, with a unified spirit, the Pact of Paris.

No decision of the European countries will any longer be able to have historical significance without the moral support and the will of the United States.

A third way to save freedom and peace is to check in time every attempt of totalitarian communism which aims at spreading itself in countries which are still free.

One of those countries which accepted the challenge of communism is my country—Greece. The Greek nation is determined to defend freedom, no matter what sacrifices are demanded. (*Applause.*)

Sacrifices, however, are not enough. Communism would have reached the Mediterranean and war would have been inevitable if the United States had not decided to help Greece. This decision, which had the gratitude of 90 per cent of the Greek people, confined the dangers of a third world war.

It would be significant, indeed, if the United Nations Commission, which observed the violations of the northern borders of Greece and which works very well, were augmented with a police force that

would completely prevent violations upon Greek soil.

Another means for the insurance of peace and freedom is not to permit the predominance of communism in Italy. Indeed, I believe that even — and this is an improbable thing—even if the Communist party won the elections in Italy, it should be prevented from attaining absolute power and abolishing democracy within that nation. (*Applause.*)

If the abolition of democracy had been hindered in 1933 in Germany, the Second World War would have been avoided. No nation had the right then, and has not the right now, to establish tyranny over freedom.

Great democracies are responsible for watching over freedom in all countries—even in those where its abolition is pursued by means of elections according to democratic methods. Only such a decided stand of the great democracies can prevent another world war.

Our decision must be to save both freedom and peace, but if this proves to be impossible, and we find ourselves in a dilemma we have only to read the two most important epitaphs that have been written — the epitaph of Lincoln and the epitaph of Pericles. Reading what these two great men said we will see that, in times of great need, we can sacrifice peace in order to save freedom, but never freedom to save peace. (*Applause.*)

**Moderator Denny:**

Thank you, Mr. Kanellopoulos, and we are complimented, sir, to have you address us in our own tongue. I wonder how many of us would do as well in Greek. Now we are very glad indeed to welcome back to Town Meeting the vigorous and alert president of the Foreign Policy Association who happened to be here in New Orleans for this World Trade Conference, and graciously consented to fill in for Mr. Sheean, who became ill late this afternoon.

Mr. Brooks Emeny, what do you think we can do to preserve peace and freedom in the world today? Mr. Emeny. (*Applause.*)

**Mr. Emeny:**

Mr. Denny, ladies and gentlemen. We have heard in a most interesting way the major manifestations of the problems we face in our fight for peace and freedom in the world. I want to try to indicate very briefly the facts which I feel we must all, as citizens, understand if we are to deal intelligently and successfully with the problems which my colleagues have indicated.

It seems to me that there are certainly four major facts that have to become a basic part of our thinking as citizens. The first and obvious one is that the atomic age has come to stay, and there's nothing in the world that can put the atomic secret back from whence it came unless it be its use for the

destruction of us all. Our difficulties arise from the fact that we as a people were educated for the pre-atomic age and that we, therefore, face the very mighty task of the re-education of ourselves, and that very soon if we are to exercise wisdom in future policies.

Another important factor, of course, is the change in the meaning of geography. We live now in the vastly shrunk world. We can no longer enjoy in this country the thought of the cushion of safety of surrounding seas. It is no longer going to be possible for our friends abroad to hold an enemy at bay, while we make up our minds what it is we're going to do. We now live forevermore on the front line of major world events.

Another very important fact is that World War II brought about the destruction of four of the seven great powers, or else their fatal weakening. It destroyed Germany and Japan and virtually destroyed the power of Italy; it fatally weakened the power of France, and it terribly weakened the power of Britain. We have emerged for all purposes into a two-power world—a very dangerous situation, indeed. In fact, we are seeing the manifestations of power politics in a two-power world at present in ways which are by no means comfortable.

Another basic fact, and one intimately related to this two-power



world problem, is the vast extension of vacuum areas of the globe. We used to speak of the Balkans as the vacuum areas—the areas of weakness, of potential disturbance, the major focal points of cause of war. The destruction of World War II was so vast that it led to the spreading of the vacuum areas until they embrace all of Europe, Asia, and the Middle East.

Today there are virtually three quarters of humanity living in conditions of such poverty, of such political disintegration—in vacuum conditions—that they remain an ever-present source of danger of great power ambitions. Nature, of course, abhors a vacuum, and we have many of the manifestations today as the attempt to fill that vacuum.

We have this picture, in other words, of Europe, Asia, and the Middle East lying in vacuum, of the vast Soviet power sprawling across the heartland of Eurasia, and American power encamped upon the shores of those unhappy lands.

We also have two very important forces at work in the world today. The first concerns the forces of modern science—the forces released by the development of modern science, forces which are going to grow and not decrease. The atomic bomb itself is but one of the manifestations of these forces.

Another major force is, of course, the revolt of the great

masses of mankind, particularly in the vacuum areas of the globe. People who are in revolt against their present circumstances and nothing in the world will down that revolt until at least their minimum needs and desires are satisfied.

These in turn present two very important dilemmas. The first is how to bring under control the forces released by modern science without thereby losing freedom. The other concerns the problem of how to bring under control the forces released by the great revolt of the masses of mankind against their present conditions.

Closely related to that is the most important dilemma of all which derives from the fact that national sovereignty—the nation state—is too puny in face of these forces at work to guarantee alone the security of the citizens owing it allegiance.

Even mighty America is too weak in face of the mighty forces at work to guarantee alone the safety of its citizens. We are faced therefore, with the inevitable necessity of the development of larger sovereignty to which all mankind may appeal for its security. Now these are the basic facts and forces of dilemmas which we as citizens must come to understand if we are to exercise intelligently our decisions in the future.

America has reached its hour of decision. We have always gone

on the assumption that it was the essence of democracy that the people decided on foreign policy, but it has now become the peril of democracy that we should decide ignorance. (*Applause.*)

**Moderator Denny:**

Thank you, Brooks Emeny, for rising so brilliantly to this occasion. I knew you'd do it. Now, as there's very little conflict and controversy among our speakers here tonight, we are going to skip over our customary discussion.

**Announcer:** You are listening to "America's Town Meeting of the Air" originating in New Orleans, Louisiana, where we're dis-

cussing the question, "How Can We Preserve Peace and Freedom Today?" We are about to take questions from the audience.

If you would like a copy of tonight's broadcast, complete with the questions and answers to follow, send for the *Town Meeting Bulletin*, enclosing ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. If you would like to subscribe to the *Bulletin* for six months, send \$2.35; for a year, send \$4.50. Just address *Town Hall, New York 18, New York*, and allow at least two weeks for delivery. Now, we return you to Mr. Denny.

## THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

**WALTER H. JUDD**—Walter Judd, Republican Congressman from Minnesota, was a medical missionary and hospital superintendent in China for a number of years (1925-31 and 1934-38), under the auspices of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. He was born in Rising Sun, Nebraska, and received his B.A. and M.D. degrees from the University of Nebraska. In 1918 he enlisted in the United States Army and served in the Field Artillery.

In 1923 he received his medical degree and not long after went to China. During a furlough in the United States he had a fellowship in surgery at the Mayo Foundation in Rochester, Minnesota (1932-34). Dr. Judd spent 1939 and 1940 speaking throughout the United States in an attempt to arouse Americans to the menace of Japan's military expansion and to get an embargo established on the sale and shipment of war materials to Japan. At the time of his election to Congress, Dr. Judd was conducting a private medical practice in Minneapolis.

**BROOKS EMENY**—Mr. Emeny has been president of the Foreign Policy Association since May, 1947. He has degrees from Princeton and Yale and has also studied in Paris, London, Vienna, and Madrid.

Mr. Emeny was an instructor of government at Yale and an associate professor at Cleveland College. He has also engaged in research and writing in Washington, D.C. He has written several books and been a member of many councils and conferences on government affairs.

**JOHN SCOTT** — Chief of the Berlin Bureau of *Time* magazine, John Scott was born in Philadelphia in 1912. He was a student at the University of Wisconsin and has also studied at the Sorbonne in Paris, and in Russia. While studying in Russia from 1932 to 1937, he also worked in the Siberian Steel Mills. From 1938 to 1941, he was a journalist in Moscow, Paris, the Balkans, Berlin, the Near East, and Japan. He returned to America in 1941 and became a contributing editor for *Time*. In 1938, he became a war correspondent for *Time* and *Life*.

Mr. Scott is the author of *Behind the Urals*, *Duel for Europe*, and *Europe in Revolution*.

**PANAYOTIS KANELLOPOULOS**—The Honorable Panayotis Kanellopoulos is a former Prime Minister of Greece and member of the Greek Parliament. He is the organizer and leader of the National Union Party.

# QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

*Mr. Denny:* Our attendants are in the aisle with the microphones, and the splendid audience of New Orleans citizens here is ready to ask questions, but first comes the question from Citizen No. 1, the distinguished Mayor de Lesseps Morrison, about whom most Americans have read and heard. He is going to ask the first question of Mr. Kanellopoulos. Mayor Morrison. (Applause.)

*Mayor Morrison:* Mr. Kanellopoulos, in your opinion, does success in politics by the Communists in any country give that party the right to practice tyranny and deprive those peoples of freedom?

*Mr. Kanellopoulos:* I believe that they do not have the right to abolish freedom. My point of view is that freedom has to be preserved with all necessary means. We have to fight for freedom even in those countries in which freedom would be defeated by democratic means. I believe that no nation has the right to abolish freedom. (Applause.)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. If the man with the microphone will kindly come down here to the third row and take the man with the seersucker suit. Thank you.

*Man:* My question is directed to Mr. Scott, please. As a student of Tulane University, I am interested to know, from the standpoint of his observation in Europe, what subversive techniques are being

used, or are likely to be used in our own American colleges and universities to endanger our freedom?

*Mr. Denny:* That's a \$64 question, is it, Mr. Scott?

*Mr. Scott:* Well, the techniques that have been used in Europe in universities have been, in the first place, the organization of cells, or basic groups, by Communists in universities, who can organize demonstrations and other expressions of alleged mass opinion on very short notice, and also the organization of study groups which begin as actual study groups to study Marxism and other forms or other aspects of communist ideology, but end up in an open propaganda war against the Western world. I should imagine that these techniques in the United States and in the universities might be expected to be more or less the same.

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. Now Mr. Judd has a question for you Mr. Scott.

*Congressman Judd:* Mr. Scott would you say that what happened in Bogota during the last week is a sample of what would happen here if it could? If we allowed it to happen?

*Mr. Scott:* I would say that what happened — well, I don't know what happened in Bogota; I don't know the causes for it—but whether the Communists get strong enough



to organize an armed insurrection, they do. I don't happen to believe that in the United States today there is anything like the danger of an armed insurrection, by the Communists or by any other group, but it is almost a matter of definition that when strong enough the Communists take those means which seem expedient to them to gain their ends. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. The gentleman on the aisle.

*Man:* I want to direct a question to Congressman Judd. How can military might sufficient to curb international bullies be maintained in a peacetime economy without at the same time destroying freedom and living standards?

*Congressman Judd:* It can't be, if the United States, or any one country, tries to do it alone. That's the whole point of the argument that I put out, if the Russians develop overwhelming power, it can be met only by a greater power. Now we are having to assume this burden in the world today. Somebody last year had to go the rescue, or at least to the assistance of the Greeks, and today to the Italians, and others who are resisting attempts to subjugate them, but we haven't the resources or the wisdom to handle that job long. Therefore, we must get a world organization, as I say, with all if they'll come along, but if not all, then get as many as can, and have justice and have preponderant force.

Alone, we can't do it. Unitedly, we can, and thereby reduce the burdens on ourselves and avoid dangers that increased constant total mobilization would bring to our own economy.

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you, Mr. Judd. We're going to get a little debate out of this because here comes John Scott.

*Mr. Scott:* I'm not going to debate. I want to say this, that the other day the representatives of the American people decided to cut our budget by four billion dollars—I mean to cut our taxes four billion dollars—and at the same time, a great many of them wanted UMT which costs about four billion dollars. We can't even have an adequate military force ourselves as long as the American people insist on cutting taxes instead of raising taxes when that would be necessary if we are going to do the other things that we should and still have UMT. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* All right, Congressman Judd.

*Mr. Judd:* I don't want to get into an argument on taxes down here, but it does not follow, as is so commonly assumed, that cutting the rates necessarily cuts down the revenue. (*Applause.*) Four times during the '20's, the tax rates were cut, and the total income for the government increased. If it's necessary to appropriate more money for National Defense, you can be sure the present Congress

will do it. But it doesn't want to go hog-wild, and it knows that if we put on too great burdens, ultimately you kill the thing from which all revenues comes. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. The gentleman over there who has a question for Mr. Emeny.

*Man:* Mr. Emeny, I'd like to know do you think that Russia's veto of Italy from the U.N. will in any way affect the forthcoming election in Italy?

*Mr. Emeny:* Well, I should imagine that it would. I think that it is a very important move so far as we're concerned. I think that the most important influence, however in Italy has been the rallying of the American people of Italian ancestry to the cause in writing letters to their own country, telling them the real meaning of freedom.

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. Now a question from the gentleman here on the second row, but before I do that I'd like for members of the balcony to know that they can ask questions and if you'll hold up question cards, recognition cards, I'll be glad to recognize you. Yes?

*Man:* Mr. Kanellopoulos. Mr. Judd, or rather Congressman Judd, made a statement about Senator Ferguson's resolution. Would you please express your opinion of this resolution now pending in the Senate, endorsing a revision of the United Nations Charter.

*Mr. Denny:* What resolution was that, sir?

*Man:* The resolution mentioned by Congressman Judd—which is Senator Ferguson's resolution, endorsing a revision of the United Nations Charter.

*Mr. Kanellopoulos:* My point of view is this: that a world organization is impossible if it is based on two different principles—on the principle of freedom and on the principle of totalitarian communism. I believe that these two things cannot work together. From this point of view, I agree with Congressman Judd that the United Nations Organization has to be changed. I don't think that it is possible to preserve peace on the basis of an organization which is based on two different principles. The veto problem is a part of this division of the two principles. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you, sir. Now, Congressman Judd.

*Congressman Judd:* While somebody else is bringing a question—just to keep the records straight—this resolution was introduced by seven Democrats and seven Republicans in the House about a month ago. The Senate finally got around to it yesterday. (*Laughter.*)

*Mr. Denny:* It is too bad, Congressman Judd, that the headline writers don't give as much attention to what originates on your side of the House as originates on the Senate side of the House.

*Congressman Judd:* Well, there

may be taking place in this country something similar to that which happened in England. I suppose originally, a good deal more attention was paid to the House of Lords, but nowadays it's the House of Commons. (*Laughter and applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* All right. The gentleman over on the other side of the house. Yes, sir.

*Man:* Congressman Judd, please. How can we ordinary citizens understand and participate when our national leaders blow hot today and cold tomorrow on the same foreign issue? SNAFU? (*Laughter and applause.*)

*Congressman Judd:* Well, it's a little difficult to answer that because it's a thing that troubles us as much as anything. I have to be frank in saying that I think Mr. Stalin must go to bed at night sometimes in the greatest perplexity, wondering what in the world United States' foreign policy is liable to be by morning. (*Laughter and applause.*)

He has demonstrated repeatedly that if he knows what it is, he conforms pretty well. Once in awhile he wants to know where there's a soft spot. If there is a soft spot, he moves in. If there isn't one, he usually doesn't. A few months ago, he had one of his satellites, Tito, shoot down a couple of our planes to see what would happen. Well, that door wasn't empty. We said, "No more of that monkey business."

Did he get mad? Oh, no. Everything's okay. He just wanted to know. But he is entitled to be sure whether we're going to stand here, there, or the other place.

Another instance of our inconsistency is this. We go to Europe and we say, "Now we'll help you if you keep the Communists out," but we spent two years in China saying, "We'll help you only if you take the Communists in." Who could make sense out of that? (*Laughter and applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. Now the question down here for Mr. Emeny.

*Man:* It turns out that the question is really very similar to the one that was just asked of Congressman Judd. I had thought of asking Mr. Emeny if it wouldn't help a great deal if our Federal Government would not be more consistent in its foreign policy?

*Mr. Emeny:* Well, I think it certainly would help a great deal, but I do say that the seeming inconsistency of the Federal Government in these matters is a reflection likewise of public opinion. I think it is that in a democracy, it is the people who must essentially lead. That leads me to one observation which I would like to make, and that is that we get very used to this idea: that with the passage of the Marshall Plan, we have made a turning in the road in foreign policy and the die is cast. But the answer to our success is going to be entirely de-



terminated upon whether we, as a people, can judge wisely, can exercise wise decisions, on events and circumstances that are bound to follow from this turning of the road in foreign policy. The Marshall Plan is not the final answer to peace and freedom. It is but the beginning. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. The lady in the balcony.

*Lady:* My question is directed to Mr. Scott. Would not the program of the United States be more convincing and subject to approval if the principles advocated were practiced here at home? (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Scott:* That's what I tried to say in the remarks I made at the beginning. I think that we've got to adhere very closely, in our own policies at home and in the areas that we control, to the principles of freedom that we adhere to and sponsor for other areas. It weakens us in Germany, I can tell you a great deal, if propagandawise, when the communist press is able to demonstrate out of the United States press, examples of violation in the United States of the freedoms which we believe in and are trying to further abroad. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. The lady over on the other side.

*Lady:* Congressman Judd. Can we convince our children we are sincerely striving for peace, yet destroy their freedom and future

security by forcibly drafting them into preparation for war?

*Mr. Denny:* Go ahead, Congressman Judd.

*Congressman Judd:* I don't think that the premise on which the question was based necessarily follows. It may get us into war, for us to try and be strong in this country, to resist the kind of thing we've seen happen to one nation after another around the world, but it doesn't necessarily happen. If we don't resist, we are enslaved—we're certain of that. If we do resist and don't handle our affairs wisely, we could break. But we don't need to. The thing to do is to take the course of least danger.

I'm a physician. A man comes in with a sore spot and I decide to operate. I recognize that sometimes things may go wrong. Complications may set in; he may die. But if I don't operate and the appendix ruptures, he is certain to die. He's just as dead whether I operate or don't operate, so you've got to evaluate the relative risks.

Personally, it was clear to all of us—and myself—that when we abandoned the draft we must reinstate it if we couldn't get enough volunteers with all the inducements we offered to enable us to meet our commitments and be prepared for any probable emergencies. We weren't able to get all of the volunteers that were necessary to meet our commitments.

I don't think that UMT is necessary—that's my personal opinion—at the present moment, and I don't expect to change it unless there's something very drastic and alarming develops than is on the horizon now. But a restoration of a highly Selective Service, to give us men actually in the armed forces doing and carrying out the functions of the Army, I think is necessary facing the world that exists. I wish we had a world of peace, but we don't have. We've got to be realistic about the world that exists. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. Another question for Mr. Emeny. All right.

*Man:* You just recently portrayed the industrial world as two great powers. Considering free and reciprocal trade relations as a component of peace, and realizing that Russia is economically dependent upon the United States, could we not force her, through reciprocal trade relations, to proper understanding of the world and us?

*Mr. Emeny:* Well, I think certainly trade relations of the future, if they can be developed along saner lines, will be a great magnet and drawing force so far as Russia is concerned. But after all, that's another one of the basic considerations in the Marshall Plan. It is to lead to the economic and industrial restoration of areas of the world outside Russia, particularly Western Europe, so that the

world's economy will be thus strengthened, and we will have a much more solid base in which to hope to win over Russia to world-wide prosperity and sane trade relationships.

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. Now the question from the balcony.

*Man:* My question is to Mr. Kanellopoulos. If Italy turns communistic, do you think that would give Russia a better chance to turn the world communist?

*Mr. Denny:* If Italy turns communist, will it give Russia a better chance to turn the world communist? A better chance?

*Mr. Kanellopoulos:* I don't think that even with Italy it will be possible for Russia to win the world. But, in any case, I agree with you that if communism prevails in Italy difficulties will increase, and especially Greece will be in a very difficult position, because Greece would be surrounded by communist states. But even in this case, the Greek nation will continue to fight and will continue to be optimistic. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. The gentleman here in the center aisle.

*Man:* My question is for Mr. Scott. Would you continue to appease Russia as we did Germany before World War II?

*Mr. Scott:* I am opposed to appeasing Russia and I was opposed to appeasing Germany then. (*Applause.*) But it seems to me that it is not enough to oppose appeasing Russia. What we've got to do

is to have a constructive policy ourselves, in order not to find ourselves in the position where we, in our foreign policy, seem to be able to do nothing better except to answer today Russia's move of yesterday or the day before. In order to put ourselves in a better position, we must have a constructive, economic, and political policy which we have not always had. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Emery:* I would like to just reinforce what Mr. Scott said. It seems to me that our great problem in this country is a restoration of complete confidence in ourselves, a confidence which can only come from an understanding on the part of all citizens of what is involved in contemporary world relationships. Also there's the other element of confidence—the confidence that comes from the knowledge that we have the physical power if we can only summon unto ourselves the mental power through understanding of what is involved. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. The gentleman on the aisle here.

*Man:* My question is to Representative Walter Judd. How much of our sovereignty should the United States be willing to surrender to make the world organization an effective body?

*Congressman Judd:* That brings up a very long and hard question, of course.

*Mr. Denny:* And you have 15 seconds, Mr. Judd.

*Congressman Judd:* Okay. The first thing I would say is this. When people say we are surrendering our sovereignty, they talk as if we have complete mastery of our destiny. No, we don't. What kind of sovereignty do you have if you don't have in your own hands and your own control the question of whether you have to go to war? There isn't any other question as important as that, yet we don't have that in our hands. That's in the other fellow's hands. Japan decided that we would go to war. So if by surrendering that kind of sovereignty, which isn't real, we can succeed in getting a world order that will establish peace based on justice and publicly controlled police force, that's the best bargain in history.

Every time I stop at a red light I surrender some sovereignty. Every time a businessman signs a contract, he limits his freedom of action. You couldn't carry on the world at all without this being done in a limited way. When we can carefully define it, it's a good bargain. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you, Congressman Judd. Now while our speakers prepare their summaries of tonight's question, here is a special message of interest to you.

*Announcer:* The demand for Mr. Denny's pamphlet *What Can I Do?* continues to increase. Perhaps you, too would like to read his answer to this question. Across America, the people are o



ganizing themselves as members of clubs, discussion groups, lecture courses and political action groups—some good, some bad, some indifferent. There is a great resurgence of interest in public questions on the part of the people, but there is as yet no educational pattern which has taken form in the field of adult education comparable to schools and colleges for the more basic types of education.

Our Town Hall, in New York, is attempting to provide a pattern for a well-rounded center of adult education using lectures, short courses, and seminars. Town Hall has issued a pamphlet written by Mr. Denny, containing a simple twelve-point program for everyone, answering the question, "What can I do?" If you would like a copy of this little pamphlet, *What Can I Do?*, send 10c to Town Hall, New York 18, N.Y.

Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here is Mr. Denny.

*Mr. Denny:* And here, for the first summary—Mr. John Scott.

*Mr. Scott:* One thing I'd like to say is this: I'm rather irked when I hear from audiences like this questions of the nature: "What can I do in order to improve things in Washington?" Washington is your representative. We have an election coming up in a few months, and the widespread impression that one seems to run into is that the people can't do anything about what Washington

does, is a serious indictment, and I think one of the reasons is because there is not as much participation and active interest on the part of the citizenry as there might be.

One other thing I'd like to say is this: If there is one thing the people of Europe don't want it is to be liberated again. I hope we won't put ourselves into a position where an American Army has to go to liberate anybody in Europe. It will defeat us more than it will gain us. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. Now a final word from Mr. Kanellopoulos.

*Mr. Kanellopoulos:* I have only to repeat that a decisive attitude of the great democracies, and especially of the United States which is *the* democracy of democracies, can prevent another World War. Any compromise with the totalitarian systems can lead to nothing but war. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you. Now a final word from Mr. Emeny.

*Mr. Emeny:* I believe the greatest task that we face today comes right down to the community. I think that every community of the land has to establish its international center. You here in New Orleans have your great International House and your Foreign Policy Association. There are many communities of the land that do not have an international center at the service of the citizens, in order to enable the citizens to

understand the kind of world we live in and the real responsibilities which we must now assume. (Applause.)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you, Mr. Emeny. Now, Walter Judd.

*Congressman Judd:* A lot of evidence indicates that Mr. Stalin and his group believe that we think we can't get along without Russia, and we give them reason to entertain that belief. Personally, I'm convinced that when we demonstrate that we can if necessary get along without them we'll find we'll be able to get along with them. (Applause.)

Our choice is not between yielding to Russia or going to war with her. Those are both bad. We have a third choice, and that's to organize with free peoples of the world, not against Russia, but for decency and honor and freedom and peace and integrity, and the free peoples of the world can achieve that kind of a world. (Applause.)

*Mr. Denny:* Thank you, Walter Judd, John Scott, Panayotis Kanellopoulos, and Brooks Emeny. Once again, let us express our appreciation to our hosts, Mayor Morrison for the City of New Orleans, International House, *Time* Magazine, and to Station WDSU for their splendid cooperation.

Now, remember friends, if you

want a copy of this discussion, you may obtain it by sending 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York. That's Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

Next week, from Columbia South Carolina, two days after the extremely important elections in Italy, we've arranged a special program by outstanding experts in the field of international relations who are also among the ablest speakers we've ever presented on Town Meeting, to give you their views on the meaning of this election as it affects Europe and our own course of action.

The topic will be, "What News in Europe Now?" Our speakers will be H. V. Kaltenborn, dean of news commentators; Harold Laski, member of the National Executive Committee of the Labor Body in Great Britain; Max Lerner, author and chief editorial writer for *PM*; and Louis V. Lochner, former chief of the Berlin Bureau of the Associated Press.

Be a town crier yourself, and use the modern town crier's bell—your telephone. Call your friends and remind them of this important broadcast next week at this time and make your own plans to listen with us next Tuesday and evening Tuesday at the sound of the Crier's bell. (Applause.)